

**REMARKS**

The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with those noted in the recent telephone call from Applicant's representative to the Examiner. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action mailed May 30, 2007, considered and rejected claims 22-36. Claim 37 was objected to, but was otherwise allowable but for a minor informality which is corrected by this amendment. Claim 22-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

By this paper, claims 22, 36 and 37 have been amended, and no claims cancelled or added. Accordingly entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

With reference to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Office Action asserts that the claims fail to meet the statutory requirements and do not "recite" either a physical transformation or production of a useful and tangible results. (Office Action, p. 3) Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, Applicant notes that the Examiner appears to have relied on an erroneous standard for analyzing claims in view of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Specifically, the Examiner appears to assert that a claim can be statutory only if the physical transformation and/or useful and tangible result is "recited" in the claim. Significantly, this interpretation is directly contrary to the guidelines set forth by the Office.

For example, as noted by Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John Love, in his memorandum to Technology Center Directors, dated April 12, 2007, Commissioner Love clarifies that "[i]f the result has a real world practical application/use then the test [for production of a useful, concrete and tangible result] is satisfied." Specifically, the "claim need not include the uses to which the result is ultimately put, just the result itself."

Accordingly, Office Policy specifically notes that the ultimate use of the result need not be "recited" in the claim itself, but only the result itself. In the previously presented claims, the claims recited a result, namely setting of directions of freedom. As clarified by the specification, such setting is useful for rendering the outline of a graphical object to be perceived by a viewer of the object.

Inasmuch as the specific use of the result is not necessary for recitation in the pending claims, Applicant has nevertheless amended the claims to clarify one specific use for the set

directions of freedom. Specifically, claims 22 and 36 have been amended to positively include using the result to render the graphical object on a display device. Accordingly, even were it necessary to recite the end use in the claims, Applicant submits that such a requirement is met by the amended claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
COLBY C. NUTTALL  
Registration No. 58,146  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:CCN:gd  
GD0000002098V001